

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

24-CR-63 (JLS) (JJM)

TRENTON GRANT,

Defendant.

DECISION AND ORDER

Defendant Trenton Grant is charged with various drug-related crimes in an Indictment returned on April 30, 2024. *See* Dkt. 1. The case has been referred to United States Magistrate Judge Jeremiah J. McCarthy to hear and determine, and report and recommend on, all pre-trial proceedings under 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and (B). *See* Dkt. 3.

On January 8, 2025, Grant filed an omnibus pretrial motion seeking, among other things, suppression of evidence seized from a vehicle on or around July 18, 2023 pursuant to the execution of a search warrant. *See* Dkt. 26.¹ The government responded in opposition and cross-moved for reciprocal discovery. Dkt. 27. Grant replied. Dkt. 29.

¹ The remaining of the omnibus motion have been resolved. *See* Dkt. 30; Dkt. 32 at 1n.2.

On March 7, 2025, Judge McCarthy issued a Report, Recommendation and Order (“R&R”), recommending that this Court deny Grant’s suppression motion. *See* Dkt. 32 at 10.²

Grant objected to the R&R. Dkt. 33. Specifically, he “objects to the Magistrate Judge’s finding that the confidential informant’s reliability was sufficiently established.” *Id.* at 1. He further argues that the “Court erred in failing to suppress the physical evidence as there was not probable cause to support issuance of a search warrant,” and that it “erred in concluding that the Good Faith Exception applied.” *Id.* at 1-3. The government opposed the objections. Dkt. 35. Grant did not reply.

A district court may accept, reject, or modify the findings or recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Crim. P. 59(b)(3). A district court must conduct a *de novo* review of those portions of a magistrate judge’s recommendation to which a party objects. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Crim. P. 59(b)(3). But neither 28 U.S.C. § 636 nor Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 59 requires a district court to review the recommendation of a magistrate judge to which no objections are raised. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985).


This Court has carefully reviewed the R&R, the objections briefing, and the relevant record. Based on that *de novo* review, the Court accepts and adopts Judge McCarthy’s recommendation.

² He also granted the government’s cross-motion for reciprocal discovery. *See id.*

For the reasons above and in the R&R, Grant's motion to suppress evidence,
see Dkt. 26, is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 14, 2025
Buffalo, New York



JOHN L. SINATRA, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE